

WAC 197-11-960 Environmental checklist.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments – Industrial Park at TransAlta Mine Site

2. Name of applicant: Industrial Park at TransAlta

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

Bill Lotto
Industrial Park at TransAlta (IPAT)
1611 North National Avenue
Chehalis, WA 98532
360-748-0114

4. Date checklist prepared:

December 16, 2009

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Lewis County

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable)

It is anticipated that the proposed Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code amendments will be scheduled for hearing in first half of 2010.

Assuming that the proposed amendments are adopted and the site is designated as an Industrial Land Bank by Lewis County, plans for infrastructure needed to facilitate development of the Industrial Park at TransAlta would be prepared over a 36-month period. The exact schedule for phasing of development is not known at this time, as it would depend on market conditions and the needs of future tenants locating at the site. Phasing of development would also need to be coordinated with reclamation of areas disturbed by mining and with ongoing mining activities. However, it is expected that full build-out of approximately 1,000 acres (consisting of sites 1-7) would occur over an 18- to 20-year period. Development of the first phase, most likely consisting of Sites 1, 2, and 3 adjoining Big Hanaford Road, would be expected occur over years 2 to 8. Site 4 is considered likely to be developed over years 7 to 10, and build-out of sites 5, 6 and 7 would be expected during years 10 to 20.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

Future work would involve installation of infrastructure and phased development of the industrial park.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

The *TransAlta Mining Site Industrial Park Feasibility Analysis* (Huitt-Zollars, 2009) includes a review of existing environmental conditions on the site and a brief analysis of potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with industrial park development.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

None known.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

The proposal is a request for approval and adoption of Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code amendments by Lewis County.

Permits and approvals that may be needed for future development would depend on the specific nature of the projects proposed.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The proposal is a non-project action involving amendment of the Lewis County Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Code and designation of approximately 4,400 acres of the TransAlta mine site as an Industrial Land Bank under the provisions of RCW 36.70A.368.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a

proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The site is located at 1015 Big Hanaford Road, Centralia, WA 98532. See site map and attached legal description for additional detail.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. **Earth**

- a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other .

The site includes flat, rolling, and hilly terrain.

- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

30%

- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

Soils on the site include clay, silt, sand, and loam.

- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

No.

- e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve filling or grading.

Future industrial development of the site would entail significant re-grading. Cutting and filling would be needed on individual development sites to create level areas for construction and grading would be needed for development of roads and utility corridors. Additional areas offsite may require filling or grading for infrastructure service and for sewer, water, and rail corridors. As specific development projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of the type and quantity of filling and grading needed for construction.

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve land clearing or construction, so no erosion would occur.

Erosion could result from land clearing, construction, and use associated with future industrial development of the site. As specific development projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of potential erosion impacts.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction of impervious surfaces.

Future development would involve construction of impervious surfaces including buildings, paved parking areas, and roadways. As specific development projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of impervious surface coverage.

g. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

The current proposal does not involve any impacts to the earth, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

Future development of the site would be subject to state and local regulations and permitting requirements designed to reduce or control erosion. Those requirements would likely include, but not be limited to:

- Obtaining permits from Lewis County for grading and filling activities;
- Complying with the Lewis County Code for work that may affect landslide hazard areas or buffers;
- Preparing and following erosion control plans;
- Employing Best Management Practices (BMPS) during construction;
- Maintaining vegetated buffers between development areas and surface waters;
- Controlling stormwater discharges; and
- Stabilizing exposed soils at completion of construction.

2. Air

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve air emissions.

Future development of the site would entail emissions such as dust and exhaust from heavy equipment during construction. It is likely that some completed projects would emit air emissions from a variety of industrial processes. As specific development projects are proposed, they would be subject to detailed analysis of potential air emissions, including determination of emissions constituents and quantities.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

No.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

The current proposal does not involve any impacts to air, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

Future development of the site would be subject to federal, state and local regulations and permitting requirements designed to reduce or control impacts to air. Those requirements would likely include, but not be limited to:

- Employing BMPS to control fugitive dust during construction;
- Obtaining burning permits before burning woody debris from land clearing;
- Registering with the Southwest Clean Air Agency;
- Complying with requirements for New Source Review, including determination of the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for pollutants and demonstration that no significant environmental deterioration will result from the project.

- Filing Notices of Construction and obtaining Air Operating Permits; and
- Obtaining a Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Permit for any new major source with the potential to emit a pollutant regulated under the Federal Clean Air Act.

3. Water

a. Surface:

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

Big Hanaford Creek is located to the north of the site and flows into the Skookumchuck River. Packwood Creek, a tributary to Big Hanaford Creek, runs through the site, nearly bisecting it. Both of these streams are perennial. Wetlands occur along both sides of Packwood Creek and some wetland areas that occur along Big Hanaford Creek may extend into the northern portion of the site. All of these wetlands have been identified as palustrine, with three classes of palustrine wetland (emergent, forested, and scrub-shrub) occurring within the site.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve work over, in, or adjacent to the streams described above.

Future development of the site may include such work; for example, construction of building pads may occur within 200 feet of Hanaford or Packwood Creeks. As specific development projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of any work proposed over, in, or adjacent to surface waters.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve placement or removal of fill or dredged material.

Future development of the site may involve such work; for example, placement of fill in surface waters may be needed for construction of stormwater discharge facilities. As specific development projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of any work involving placement of fill or dredged material in surface waters or wetlands.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve surface water withdrawals or diversions.

Future development of the site would create a demand for domestic and process water and infrastructure necessary to convey water from a source. The feasibility report prepared for the proposal estimates that at full build-out, the industrial park could require approximately 1.5 millions gallons of water per day. This is a preliminary planning-level estimate that should be considered a high maximum potential and is likely to be less; exact quantities would not be known until specific projects are proposed. Infrastructure planning would include analysis of potential water supply sources, including transfer of existing surface water rights or development of new surface water rights.

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

The site is not within a 100-year floodplain.

- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve discharges of waste materials to surface waters.

Future development of the site could include such discharges; for example, a tenant or tenants may propose to discharge treated industrial process wastewater or domestic sewage to streams. Discharges to surface waters would be subject to federal and state waste discharge permitting requirements. As specific development projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of any discharges of waste to surface waters, including waste types and volumes.

b. Ground:

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve withdrawals of or discharges to ground water.

Future development of the site would likely decrease infiltration of surface water to groundwater owing to construction of impervious surfaces. Some future projects could involve proposals for withdrawal of ground water to meet some or all of their water needs. Infrastructure planning would include analysis of potential water supply sources, including development of on-site groundwater supplies or extension of the City of Centralia's municipal water system, which is currently supplied by groundwater wells. Some future projects could involve proposals for discharge of wastewater to ground water. As specific development projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of any withdrawals of or discharges to ground water, including volumes.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve discharge of waste material into the ground.

Future development of the site may include such discharges; for example, septic tank effluent or industrial waste could be discharged into the ground. Discharges into the ground would be subject to federal and state waste discharge permitting requirements. As specific development projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of any discharges of waste to ground waters, including waste types and volumes.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

Runoff from the site currently consists of stormwater. Runoff is controlled by an existing system of ditches, downdrains, sediment control structures and permitted discharge points into Big Hanaford and Packwood Creeks. The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve any modification of this existing system.

Future development of the site would change the rate of runoff from the site owing to increases in impervious surfaces. Industrial development would likely require modification of the existing stormwater control system and/or construction of new stormwater systems. As specific projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of runoff sources and rates and development of stormwater management plans.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve any activity that could result in waste materials entering ground or surface waters.

Activities associated with future development of the site could cause entry of waste materials into ground or surface waters; for example, ground clearing and grading could cause sediment to enter surface waters, stormwater runoff from parking areas and roads could carry oils or other waste into surface waters, domestic sewage could be discharged from septic systems, or industrial wastes could be discharged from some locations. As specific projects are proposed they will be subject to detailed analysis of the potential for waste materials to enter ground or surface waters.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:

The current proposal does not involve any surface, ground, or runoff water impacts, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

Future development of the site would be subject to federal, state and local regulations and permitting requirements designed to reduce or control impacts to ground and surface waters. Those requirements would likely include, but not be limited to:

- Obtaining permits from Lewis County for grading and filling activities;
- Preparing and following Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans for project construction and operation;
- Complying with the Lewis County Code for work in wetlands or wetland buffers, including providing compensatory mitigation for impacts to these areas;
- Obtaining coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Stormwater General Permit for clearing and grading disturbing 5 or more acres;
- Obtaining an NPDES permit for release of stormwater from any completed project and demonstration that "all known, available, and reasonable treatment" (AKART) will be applied to remove pollutants from waters before discharge;
- Obtaining Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA) for any work over or within surface waters;
- Obtaining a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit for work within 200 feet of state waters;
- Obtaining a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 permit from the Department of the Army for discharge of fill or dredge material into wetlands or surface waters;
- Obtaining a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Department of Ecology for discharges into wetlands or surface waters;
- Obtaining a Wastewater Discharge Permit from the Department of Ecology for discharge of industrial process wastewater to surface or ground waters;
- Obtaining a local or state permit for discharge of domestic sewage to drainfields; and
- Obtaining water rights for use of surface or ground waters.

Specific development projects may include measures to reduce water use such as re-use of domestic or process wastewater.

4. Plants

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

- _____ ☒ deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- _____ ☒ evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- _____ ☒ shrubs
- _____ ☒ grass
- _____ pasture
- _____ crop or grain

—— wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
—— water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
—— other types of vegetation

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve removal or alteration of any vegetation.

Although the majority of the site was previously disturbed by mining, future development could involve construction in some areas that have not been disturbed.

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

No threatened or endangered plant species are known to be near or on the subject site.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

The current proposal does not involve any impacts to vegetation, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

Future development of the site would be subject to federal, state and local regulations and permitting requirements designed to reduce or control impacts to vegetation. Those requirements would likely include, but not be limited to:

- Complying with the Lewis County Code for work in wetlands or wetland buffers, including providing compensatory mitigation for impacts to these areas;
- Obtaining a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 permit from the Department of the Army for discharge of fill or dredge material into wetlands;
- Employing BMPs during construction to minimize disturbance of vegetated areas; and
- Revegetating exposed areas once construction is complete.

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:

mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Threatened or endangered species that may occur in the vicinity include the northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet; however, neither species is known to use the site.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

WDFW Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) maps indicate the presence of Roosevelt Elk winter range over a large portion of the site. Although local streams have experienced significant historical alteration, anadromous coho salmon are known to use Packwood Creek and other tributaries of Big Hanaford Creek to gain access to headwater spawning areas. The site lies along the Pacific Flyway, a major north-south route for migratory birds.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

The current proposal does not involve any impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitat, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

Future development of the site would be subject to federal, state and local regulations and permitting requirements designed to reduce or control impacts to wildlife. Those requirements would likely include, but not be limited to:

- Complying with the Lewis County Code for work in fish and wildlife habitat areas and wetlands or wetland buffers, including providing compensatory mitigation for impacts to these areas;
- Complying with regulations regarding maintenance of water quality (see Section B.3, above);
- Maintaining undeveloped areas within the site as open space and a habitat buffer; and
- Complying with applicable provisions of the Endangered Species Act.

6. Energy and natural resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve use of energy.

Future industrial development of the site would require electrical power and petroleum fuels for operation of construction equipment. Tenants locating at the site would need electrical power and natural gas for general operations and industrial processes. Infrastructure planning would include analysis of potential power supply sources and needed utility extensions and/or upgrades. As specific projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of their energy needs.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties?
If so, generally describe.

The current proposal is a non-project action and would have no effect on the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties.

It is not expected that future development of the site would entail such effects because the site is surrounded by undeveloped forest lands, TransAlta mining operations, and agricultural pasture lands. However, as specific projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of their potential impacts on solar power use by adjacent properties.

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal?
List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

The current proposal would have no impact on energy, so no energy conservation features are proposed.

Energy conservation features incorporated into future development projects would depend on the specific nature of each proposed project.

7. Environmental health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal?
If so, describe.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve environmental health hazards.

Industries locating at the site in the future could involve some processes having environmental health hazards, including exposure to dangerous or toxic chemicals, storage and use of hazardous materials, risk of fire and explosion, risk of spills, and generation of hazardous wastes.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

The current proposal is a non-project action and would not involve a need for any special emergency services.

Future development of the site could trigger the need for special emergency services. For example, there would be the potential for an increase in calls to police related to trespassing, vandalism, and traffic incidents, and calls for fire protection related to injuries, fire, and release of hazardous materials. Construction of industrial facilities would increase the demand for fire inspections and plan reviews. As specific projects are proposed they would be subject to evaluation of their demand for special emergency services.

2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

The current proposal would have no impact on special emergency services, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

Future development of the site would be subject to federal, state and local requirements designed to reduce the risk of fire and safety hazards. Those requirements would likely include, but not be limited to:

- Complying with federal and state workplace health and safety regulations;
- Complying with federal and state regulations and permitting requirements for generation, treatment, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials;
- Complying with Department of Natural Resources (DNR) regulations for work in forested lands; and
- Coordinating with the Lewis County Fire Marshall and Sheriff's Department.

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

Existing noise will have no effect on the current proposal.

Heavy equipment is currently operated on site 24 hours per day and automobile traffic and train traffic can occur at any time; however, it is not expected that existing noise would have any effect on future development of the site.

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

The current proposal is a non-project action and would not create noise.

Future development of the site would entail noise during construction from heavy equipment such as bulldozers, backhoes, air compressors and pneumatic tools. Industries locating at the site could generate noise from a variety of industrial operations. As specific projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of their potential for generating noise, including types, timing, and duration of noise.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

The current proposal would have no noise impacts, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

Future development of the site would be subject to federal workplace noise standards as well as state and local environmental noise standards designed to reduce impacts from noise. Further, local permits for such developments

could contain conditions such as installing noise barriers or requiring preservation or establishment of vegetative buffers if needed to reduce noise impacts.

8. Land and shoreline use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

The site exists primarily of reclaimed or partly reclaimed mine areas. Other nearby and adjacent land uses include mining, electrical generation, farming, forestry, and agriculture. Some adjacent lands are undeveloped.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

Some areas of the site were historically used for agricultural purposes.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

Existing structures include conveyors, coal unloading facilities, tanks, and buildings including the electric generating facility and mine office buildings.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

The current proposal is a non-project action and would not involve demolition of structures.

It is not expected that future development of the site would involve demolition of existing structures.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

The current zoning classifications vary by tax parcel within the site and include RAI, Mineral Resource, Forest Resource, and RDD 20.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

The current comprehensive plan designation is industrial.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

The current shoreline master program designation is Rural Environment.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

The site has not been classified as environmentally sensitive. It does contain critical areas as defined by the Lewis County Code.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

The current proposal is a non-project action and would not directly entail employment.

Designation of the site as an Industrial Land Bank would provide a location for large industrial developments that would increase employment in the construction and manufacturing sectors in Lewis County and would have secondary benefits for other businesses providing support services. The feasibility report prepared for the proposal estimates that development of the industrial park could support between 2,000 and 8,000 direct jobs by 2030. While up to 8,000 jobs have been identified in some analyses it is far more realistic and likely that a mix of employers at this location could result in 2,000 to 3,500 direct jobs during the time span to 2030.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve displacement of persons.

Future development of the site would not result in any displacements.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

Displacement impacts are not expected and no mitigation measures are proposed.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

RCW 36.70A.368 allows counties planning under the Growth Management Act to designate a master planned location for major industrial activity outside Urban Growth Areas on lands formerly used or designated for surface coal mining and supporting uses. This proposal involves amending the Lewis County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code and designating a site formerly used for coal mining as an Industrial Land Bank consistent with the provisions of the Growth Management Act. These amendments would provide a means for Lewis County to review and consider future proposals for industrial development at the site. Any approvals of such proposals may be conditioned to ensure that they are compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans.

Adjacent land uses include coal mining and other activities associated with the TransAlta Centralia Operations and agriculture. Some adjacent lands are undeveloped Forest Resource lands. Development of an industrial park at the site would be compatible with these uses. There are approximately 15 residences located 0.25 to 0.5 mile north of the site's northwestern boundary. Distance would to some degree buffer those residences from activities on the site; further, mitigation measures such as those described in this checklist would likely be required by project permits to avoid or minimize environmental impacts of specific projects and help to ensure that the industrial park is compatible with rural residential uses.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

The current proposal is a non-project action and would not provide housing.

It is not expected that any on-site housing would be associated with future development projects on the site.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

The current proposal is a non-project action and would not eliminate housing.

No housing would be eliminated by future development projects on the site.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

Housing impacts are not expected and no mitigation measures are proposed.

10. Aesthetics

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not include construction of any structures.

Future development projects would involve construction of new structures, roads and parking areas, and other appurtenant facilities. The height of new structures and exterior building materials to be used would not be known until specific projects are proposed.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve alteration or obstruction of views.

Future development of the site would alter views by clearing vegetation and constructing new structures. Views of the site from adjacent lands are limited by topography and forest vegetation, so future development projects would not be likely to obstruct views in the immediate vicinity.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

The current proposal would have no aesthetic impacts, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

Future development of the site would not be expected to significantly affect views from adjacent areas; however, local permits for such developments could contain conditions such as specifying exterior colors to be used or requiring preservation or establishment of vegetative buffers if needed to reduce visual impacts.

11. Light and glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

The current proposal is a non-project action and would not produce light or glare.

Future development of the site would involve safety lighting and lights from motorized equipment during construction. Completed projects would have safety and ambient lighting at parking areas, building entries, and perimeter locations. Future projects could include structures that require lighting for aircraft safety. There would be an increase in traffic and an attendant increase in light from vehicle headlights.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

Since the current proposal would not produce light or glare, there would be no safety hazards or interference with views.

Construction of future development projects would most likely occur during daylight hours, so light and glare from those activities would be short-term and minimal. Lighting from completed projects is not expected to create any safety hazards. Nearby residents would likely notice a general increase in lighting, but completed projects would not be expected to significantly interfere with views because views of the site from adjacent lands are limited by topography and forest vegetation.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

None.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

The current proposal would have no light or glare impacts, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

Future development of the site would not be expected to have significant light or glare impacts; however, local permits for specific projects could contain conditions such as requiring the use of shielding on light fixtures or preservation or establishment of vegetative buffers if needed to reduce lighting impacts.

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

No recreational activities occur within the immediate area.

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

The current proposal is a non-project action would not displace any existing recreational uses.

No recreational uses would be displaced by future development of the site.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

No impacts on recreation are expected and no mitigation measures are proposed.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

No places included on or eligible for listing on preservation registers are known to exist on or next to the site.

- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

None known.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve any ground disturbance, so there would be no impacts to historic or cultural resources.

No historic or cultural resources are known to be present on the site, the site has been previously disturbed by mining, and the probability of locating evidence of historic or cultural resources is low. Nonetheless, construction associated with future development projects could reveal evidence of such resources. Future development of the site would be subject to applicable federal and state requirements relating to preservation of historic and cultural resources. In the event any artifacts or other indications of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance were to be discovered during land clearing, activity in the area of the find would cease until it could be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist.

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

The site is served by Big Hanaford Rd., which is a county road. The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve changes in access to the existing street system.

It is expected that the site would continue to be accessed from Big Hanaford Rd. Access improvements that may be needed to serve future industrial development of the site are not known at this time, but would be a part of specific development proposals.

b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

No. Public transportation is available in the city of Centralia which is located approximately 6 miles from the site.

c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or elimination of parking spaces.

Future development projects would involve construction of new parking facilities. The number of parking spaces, their location, and layout would not be known until specific projects are proposed.

d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction of new roadways or improvements to existing roadways.

Future development of the site would involve construction of new interior roads. Improvements to public roadways may be needed if any future proposed project at the site were found to have an impact on the road network beyond its capacity.

e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

The current proposal is a non-project action and does not involve use of water, rail, or air transportation.

Future development projects may rely on rail service to transport goods to and from the site; this would require extending a new rail spur to the site or rehabilitating an existing, abandoned rail line that would connect to the BNSF rail line. Infrastructure planning would include analysis of potential rail improvement options. Tenants locating at the site may also use waterborne transportation for shipping of goods. The site does not offer direct access to deep-draft shipping, but tenants could transfer goods by rail or truck to and from the Port of Olympia (30 miles distant), the Port of Tacoma (60 miles distant), or other deepwater ports within 100 miles of the site.

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

The current proposal is a non-project action and would not generate vehicular trips.

Future development would increase vehicle trips for transporting employees, service personnel, and goods to and from the site. The increases would occur incrementally as the industrial park would be built in phases. The feasibility report prepared for the proposal estimates that at full build-out, weekday trips generated would range from 1,617 to 3,906. This is a planning-level estimate only; as specific development projects are proposed, they would be subject to detailed analysis of their effects on traffic generation.

g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

The current project would not have any impacts on transportation, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

Mitigation for impacts to the transportation system that would result from future development of the site would depend on the specific projects proposed and their associated traffic impacts, and could include both non-structural and structural measures. Potential mitigation measures could include, but would not be limited to:

- Implementing congestion management practices such as strategic shift stacking, promoting carpooling, designating alternative freight and commuter routes;
- Extending Eckerson Rd. to Reynolds Ave., allowing truck traffic from the site to access Interstate 5 (I-5) without having to travel on the west side of I-5 through Centralia's retail corridor; and
- Constructing a connection between Smith and Blair Rds., allowing traffic traveling south on I-5 to exit at Grand Mound, travel south to Hobson Rd./Smith Rd. S. and then to Blair Rd., Reynolds Rod., and on to the site. This would allow traffic traveling south on I-5 to the site to avoid the commercial area adjacent to I-5.

15. Public services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

The current proposal is a non-project action and would not result in an increased need for public services.

Future development of the site could result in an increased need for fire and police protection, as discussed above in Section B.7.a.2 of this checklist. Businesses locating at the site would be expected to draw the majority of their employees from within Lewis County, and would therefore not be expected to significantly increase school enrollments. As specific projects are proposed they would be subject to evaluation of their demand for public services.

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

The current proposal would have no impact on public services, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

As described above in B.7.a.2 of this checklist, future development of the site would be subject to federal, state and local requirements designed to reduce the risk of fire and safety hazards and the need for public services. Those requirements would likely include, but not be limited to:

- Complying with federal and state health and safety regulations;
- Complying with federal and state regulations and permitting requirements for generation, treatment, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials;
- Complying with Department of Natural Resources (DNR) regulations for work in forested lands; and
- Coordinating with the Lewis County Fire Marshall and Sheriff's Department.

16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, ice, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

The current proposal is a non-project action, and does not involve use of utilities.

Future development of the site would require electrical power, domestic and process water supply, sanitary sewer (and possibly septic systems), natural gas, telecommunications, and refuse service. Providers include the Lewis County Public Utility District for electrical power; Puget Sound Energy for natural gas; a number of companies for telecommunications services; the City of Centralia for municipal water supply and sanitary sewer; and Lemay Inc. for refuse service. In addition to these private and public utility suppliers, TransAlta Centralia Operations has existing water rights, a wastewater treatment plant and an electrical generation facility.

Utility improvements would be required to serve new industrial development. These improvements could include, but not be limited to:

- Extension of existing electrical transmission lines and construction of new substations;
- Extension of the City of Centralia's municipal water supply system;
- Construction of on-site septic systems, expansion of the existing TransAlta treatment plant, or extension of the City of Centralia's sanitary sewer system;
- Extension of the existing natural gas pressure system; and
- Extension of existing telecommunications lines.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature:

Date Submitted:

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

The current proposal would not directly increase discharges to water, emissions to air, production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances, or production of noise. However, the proposal would allow for future industrial development of the site that would increase discharges of domestic and process wastewater, discharges of stormwater runoff, fugitive and point source air emissions, and production of noise. Future developments could entail production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances. Specifics on these items would not be known until projects were proposed and evaluated as to their environmental effects.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

Water. Future development of the site would be subject to federal, state and local regulations and permitting requirements designed to reduce or control impacts to ground and surface waters. Those requirements are discussed in more detail in Section B.3.d of this checklist

Air. Future development of the site would be subject to federal, state and local regulations and permitting requirements designed to reduce or control impacts to air. Those requirements are discussed in more detail in Section B.2.c of this checklist.

Hazardous Substances. Future development of the site would be subject to federal, state and local regulations and permitting requirements pertaining to the production, storage, and release of hazardous substances, including, but not limited to complying with the applicable provisions of the federal Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), the Resource Recovery and Conservation Act (RCRA), the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA), the Washington State Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA), state dangerous waste and pollution prevention laws (Title 70 RCW), and state dangerous waste and toxic substances rules (WAC 173-303, 173-307, and 173-333).

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

The current proposal would not directly affect plants, animals, or fish. However, the proposal would allow for future industrial development of the site that would affect plants through land clearing and that could affect fish and wildlife by placement of fill or structures in streams and wetlands.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

Future development of the site would be subject to federal, state and local regulations and permitting requirements designed to reduce or control impacts to fish and wildlife. Those requirements would likely include, but not be limited to:

- Complying with the Lewis County Code for work in fish and wildlife habitat areas and wetlands or wetland buffers, including providing compensatory mitigation for impacts to these areas;
- Complying with regulations regarding maintenance of water quality (see Section B.3.d, above);
- Maintaining undeveloped areas within the site as open space and a habitat buffer; and
- Complying with applicable provisions of the Endangered Species Act.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

The current proposal would not directly deplete energy or natural resources. However, the proposal would allow for future industrial development of the site that would require energy for construction and operation. As specific projects are proposed they would be subject to detailed analysis of their energy needs.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

Energy conservation features incorporated into future development projects would depend on the specific nature of each proposed project.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

The current proposal would not directly use or effect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated, eligible, or under study for governmental protection. However, the proposal would allow for future industrial development of the site that could affect sensitive areas through the placement of fill or structures in wetlands.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

Future development of the site would be subject to federal, state and local regulations and permitting requirements designed to reduce or control impacts to wetlands. Those requirements would include complying with the Lewis County Code for work in wetlands or wetland buffers, including providing compensatory mitigation for impacts to these areas, obtaining a CWA Section 404 permit for discharge of fill or dredge material in waters of the U.S. (including wetlands), and obtaining a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Department of Ecology for discharges into wetlands.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The proposal would change land use of the site from reclaimed mine lands to industrial use.

RCW 36.70A.368 allows counties planning under the Growth Management Act to designate a master planned location for major industrial activity outside Urban Growth Areas on lands formerly used or designated for surface coal mining and supporting uses. The proposal involves amending the Lewis County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code and designating a site formerly used for coal mining as an Industrial Land Bank consistent with the provisions of the Growth Management Act. These amendments would provide a means for Lewis County to review and consider future proposals for industrial development at the site. Any approvals of such proposals may be conditioned to ensure that they are compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans.

The proposal includes amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to ensure that it would not encourage urban growth outside the adopted urban growth boundaries. Under the proposal Land Use (LU) Policy 2.4 would be amended to state that "Urban growth should occur within urban growth areas only and not be permitted outside of an adopted urban growth area except for new fully contained communities; master planned resorts, industrial reserve areas (IRAs), major industrial developments, crossroads communities and rural town centers."

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

Adjacent land uses include coal mining and other activities associated with the TransAlta Centralia Operations and agriculture. Some adjacent lands are undeveloped Forest Resource lands. Development of an industrial park at the site would be compatible with these uses. There are approximately 15 residences located 0.25 to 0.5 mile north of the site's northwestern boundary. Distance would to some degree buffer those residences from activities on the site; further, mitigation measures such as those described elsewhere in this checklist would likely be required by project permits to avoid or minimize environmental impacts of specific projects and help to ensure that the industrial park is compatible with rural residential uses.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

The current proposal would not directly increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities. However, the proposal would allow for future industrial development of the site that would increase demand in these areas. Future development would increase vehicle trips for transporting employees, service personnel, and goods to and from the site. Future projects may also rely on rail service to transport goods to and from the site, requiring extension or rehabilitation of existing rail lines. Development of the site could trigger the need for special emergency services and an increase in calls to police and for fire protection. There would be increased demand for fire inspections and plan reviews. Development projects would require electrical power, domestic and process water supply, sanitary sewer (and possibly septic systems), natural gas, and telecommunications.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

Measures to reduce the need to special emergency services are discussed in Section 7.a.2 of this checklist.

Utility extensions and improvements would be constructed to serve the site. These improvements may include extension of existing electrical transmission lines and construction of new substations; extension of the City of Centralia's municipal water supply system; construction of on-site septic systems, expansion of the existing TransAlta treatment plant, or extension of the City of Centralia's sanitary sewer system; extension of the existing natural gas pressure system; and extension of existing telecommunications lines.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

No conflicts with local, state, or federal laws or environmental protection requirements have been identified.